United States Patent and Trademark Office

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,191	03/24/2004	Maria Theresa Barnes-Leon	384818042US1	6005

25096	7590	07/05/2005

PERKINS COIE LLP
PATENT-SEA
P.O. BOX 1247
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER
WONG, LESLIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/809,191	BARNES-LEON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leslie Wong	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 April 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 March 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/07/2005</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 07 April 2005, is acknowledged.

Withdrawal of Rejection

2.   Applicants' amendments, submitted on 07 April 2005, overcome the 101 rejection

and the objection to the title of the invention. Examiner hereby withdrawn the

rejection/objection that were given in the Office Action dated 23 December 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Hellman et al. ("Hellman") (US 20030163597A1).

        Regarding claims 1 and 12, **Hellman** teaches a method and computer-readable

medium in a computing system for managing enterprise data, the method comprising:

a).   extracting enterprise information in a first form that is associated with a

first source computerized system (¶s 0045, 0070, 0074);

b).   converting the enterprise information in the first form into corresponding

information that is in a second intermediate form (¶s 0058, 0059, 0074, 0198); and

c).   converting the enterprise information in the second intermediate form into

a target form that corresponds to a target computerized system, wherein the second

intermediate form includes a plurality of custom data type elements that are adapted for

capturing customer information and that can be referenced by other data structures in

the second intermediate form (¶s 0048, 0071, 0074, 0198, 0202, 0390-0393).

Regarding claim 2, **Hellman** further teaches the steps of:

a).   extracting enterprise information in a third form that is associated with a

second source computerized system that is distinct from the first source computerized

system (¶s 0045 and 0074);

b).   converting the enterprise information in the third form into enterprise

information that is in the second intermediate form (¶s 0198, 0200); and

c).   converting the enterprise information in the second intermediate form into

the target form (¶s 0048, 0074).

Regarding claim 3, **Hellman** further teaches wherein the customer information

includes information that defines specific aspects of the customer's business (¶ 0390).

Regarding claim 4, **Hellman** further teaches wherein the custom data type

elements include one or more elements comprising: an address custom data type

element; an auto deal custom data type element; an auto policy custom data type

element; an auto sales history custom data type element; an auto service history

custom data type element; an auto service job custom data type element; an auto

service repair order custom data type element; a balance statement custom data type

element; a billing profile custom data type element; a bill of material component custom

data type element; a bill of material custom data type element; a business unit custom

data type element (¶s 0390 and 0393).

Regarding claim 5, **Hellman** further teaches wherein the custom data type

elements include one or more elements comprising: a claim custom data type element;

a claim payment custom data type element; a class attribute custom data type element;

a class attribute value custom data type element; a class custom data custom data type

element; a contact-of custom data type element; a contract custom data type element; a

cost list custom data type element; and a cost list line custom data type element (¶s

0390 and 0393).

Regarding claim 6, **Hellman** further teaches wherein the custom data type

elements include one or more elements comprising: a credit bureau report custom data

type element; a customer-of custom data type element; an employee-of custom data

type element; an expense custom data type element; an expense line custom data type

element; a financial account custom data type element; a financial applicant custom

data type element; a financial application account custom data type element; a financial

application collateral custom data type element; a financial application custom data type

element; a financial application funding source custom data type element; and a

financial statement custom data type element (¶s 0390 and 0393).

Regarding claim 7, **Hellman** further teaches wherein the custom data type

elements include one or more elements comprising: a forecast custom data type

element; a forecast line detail custom data type element; a product catalog custom data

type element; a product catalog line item custom data type element; a product custom

data type element; a product inventory location custom data type element; a product

line custom data type element; a product price custom data type element; an installed

product custom data type element; a price list custom data type element; and a price list

line custom data type element (¶s 0390 and 0393).

Regarding claim 8, **Hellman** further teaches wherein the custom data type

elements include one or more elements comprising: a purchase order custom data type

element; a purchase order line item custom data type element; a vehicle anti theft

device custom data type element; a vehicle custom data type element; a vehicle option

custom data type element; a person custom data type element; a policy custom data

type element; a position custom data type element; a related-to custom data type

element; a represented-by custom data type element; a security custom data type

element; a service request custom data type element; and a set of books custom data type element (Appendix A, page 29, ¶s 0390 and 0412).

Regarding claim 9, **Hellman** further teaches wherein the custom data type elements include one or more elements comprising: an order custom data type element; an order line custom data type element; an order type custom data type element; an organization custom data type element; a party authentication custom data type element; a party custom data type element; a payment custom data type element; a payment line custom data type element; a payment method custom data type element; a payment term custom data type element; and a payment type custom data type element (¶s 0390 and 0393).

Regarding claim 10, **Hellman** further teaches wherein the custom data type elements include one or more elements comprising: an opportunity custom data type element; an opportunity notes custom data type element; an opportunity revenue item custom data type element; an invoice custom data type element; an invoice line custom data type element; an invoice plan custom data type element; an invoice type custom data type element; a life policy custom data type element; and a list of relationship custom data type element (¶s 0390 and 0393).

Regarding claim 11, **Hellman** further teaches wherein the custom data type elements include one or more elements comprising: an inventory balance custom data

type element; an inventory balance list of balance balance custom data type element;

an inventory transaction custom data type element; an inventory location custom data

type element; a functional area custom data type element; a holding custom data type

element; and a household custom data type element (¶s 0390 and 0393).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6.   Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hellman et al. ("Hellman") (US 20030163597A1).

Regarding claims 13-20, they may include limitations not covered in the prior art;

however, these elements are data structures per se, the data and software structures

are considered to be non functional data and are considered to be *directed to data Per*

Se. Thus, the difference is limited to non-functional descriptive material stored on a

machine which cannot render an invention non-obvious for an invention that would

otherwise have been obvious (see MPEP 2106 IV B 1 (b) and 2126 VI). The fact that

the data can be recalled does not make it functional.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Ell, Todd (US 20020035431 A1)

Thompson et al. (US 6668253 B1)

Response to Argument

8.   Applicant's arguments filed 07 April 2005have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicants argue that independent claim 1 requires "converting information in a

first form" into a "second intermediate form". Claim 1 also requires converting the

second intermediate form into a "target form".   In other words, Claim 1 requires three

forms of data, namely, a first form, an intermediate and a target form. In contrast,

Hellman suggest, at best, only tow forms of data, namely, XML Schema and

class/relation definitions. In Hellman, a fist form is converted to a second form, and the

second is converted back to the first form.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that

Hellman teaches the limitations of claim 1: *converting information in a first form into a*

second intermediate form and converting the second intermediate form into a target

form as **mapping from a web of distributed class and relation definitions to a**

global ontology model (i.e., converting first form into a second intermediate form).

The distributed ontology allows an ontology model to be built up from an ontology web

of distributed sets of class and relation definitions (¶s 0098 and 0142). Further, the

present invention also allows ontological information to be exported to XML Schema,

relational database, RDF schema and simple text documents. Figs 4A and 4B,

illustrates **exporting from an ontology to an XML Schema** (i.e., converting the second

intermediate form into a target form)(¶s 188 and 191).

Hellman also teaches if an invoice of Fig. 1 is modeled using an XML Schema

intended for transfer of the invoice to a customer's procurement system, *it is unlikely*

that manufacturing and finance departments will find the information they require in an

XML document for an invoice. If one were to model a full graph of relations between

classes using self-referential XML Schema, such a Schema would be unusable, as no

finite instance document would be valid according to the Schema. **It may thus be**

appreciated that an ontological model provides a more flexible basis for

presenting data than does an XML Schema, particularly where the same data

must be presented to multiple application (¶s 0046-0048).

Applicants' Specification discloses an enterprise may employ various systems to

manage various aspects of human resources and enterprise resources. The various

systems can include Human Resource Management (HRM) systems, Employee

Relationship Management (ERM) systems, and Supply Chain Management (SCM)

etc... Such as enterprise system is herein referred to as a multi-application integration

system (MAIS). The various systems in the MAIS need to communicate data to each

other. However, the users of enterprise data in the back-office typically store data in

forms usable by the back-office computerized system, which often differ significantly

from the forms usable with front-office computerized systems. Thus, in order for front-

office computerized systems to communicate with back-office computerized systems,

there is a need to synchronize the enterprise data in both computerized systems (page

1, paragraph 3 to page 2, paragraph 4). Further, Applicants' Specification suggests that

converting enterprise information by converting the enterprise information that is in the

first source format into an intermediate format. *The intermediate format includes a*

plurality of custom data type elements that are adapted for capturing unique customer

information that are relevant to the customer's business systems. The intermediate

format is then used to convert the enterprise information into the target format (page 8,

paragraph 61).

Based on the above reasons, Examiner submits that Hellman teaches *converting information in a first form into a second intermediate form and converting the second intermediate form into a target form as claimed and that it is in conformity with the Applicants' invention as spelled out from the above paragraphs.*

Further, Applicants argue that Hellman also fails to disclose a second intermediate form for independent claims 12 and 13. In response to the preceding argument, Examiner respectfully submits that Hellman teaches *a second intermediate form* as **a global ontology model** as discussed and analyzed from the above. Hence, Hellman teaches the limitation as claimed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-
4120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number
for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Leslie Wong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2167

LW
June 24, 2005